United Nations A/60/414–S/2005/628

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
5 October 2005

Original: English

General Assembly
Sixtieth session
Agenda item 19
Question of Cyprus

Security Council
Sixtieth year

Letter dated 4 October 2005 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith a letter dated 4 October 2005, addressed to you by Mr. Reşat Çağlar, Representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see annex) forwarding a letter from Mr. Mehmet Ali Talat, President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see enclosure).

I should be grateful if the text of the present letter, its annex and enclosure could be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 19, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Baki **İlkin**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

05-53827 (E) 071005

Annex to the letter dated 4 October 2005 from the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to convey herewith a copy of a letter dated 30 September 2005, addressed to you by Mr. Mehmet Ali Talat, President of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus (see enclosure).

(*Signed*) Re at **Çağlar**
Representative
Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

Enclosure

I have the honour to refer to the statement made by the Greek Cypriot leader, Mr. Tassos Papadopoulos, at the sixtieth session of the General Assembly in New York on 18 September 2005.

It should be stressed from the outset that, to our utmost disappointment, the speech has clearly revealed, once again, that the Greek Cypriot leadership neither has the political will nor the resolve to engage in a genuine effort for the settlement of the Cyprus problem in a reasonable period of time under the United Nations umbrella.

Instead, the Greek Cypriot leader chose to repeat his well known arguments vis-á-vis the Cyprus problem, the Annan plan and the future of the United Nations settlement process, which are far from being convincing or fostering hope for the settlement of the Cyprus problem in the near future.

He reiterated his claim that rejecting the Annan plan is not rejecting the solution itself in the island. However, your remarks on the matter contained in your report on your mission of good offices (S/2004/437) dated 28 May 2004, which clearly underlines that "What was rejected [by the Greek Cypriots] was the solution itself rather than a mere blueprint" need no further elaboration.

He also asserts that the plan was divisive and could not provide for and could not bring about the reunification of the island. In other words, the Greek Cypriot leader is suggesting that the United Nations, which has been involved in the Cyprus problem for over four decades to help facilitate the reunification of the island and mandated as such by the Security Council, has somehow finalized a plan that is outside the parameters of the Security Council resolutions on Cyprus and does not envisage the unification of the island. This argument is also tantamount to suggesting that the European Union (EU) as well, which has always supported the unification of the island, has instead fully supported a settlement plan that will perpetuate its division.

The truth of the matter is that the plan finalized by the United Nations and fully supported by the EU was a compromise plan, which envisaged the unification of the island along the parameters contained in the Security Council resolutions. In this context, I would like to refer to the briefing to the Council of the then United Nations Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, Sir Kieran Prendergast, on 22 June 2005, following his visit to our region. In this briefing, among other things, he stated, and I quote: "The plan as finalized by the Secretary-General is fully in accordance with the vision of a settlement contained in Security Council resolutions" (para. 23). Thus, the Greek Cypriot side should come up with better arguments to justify its rejection of the Annan plan, which had gathered the full support of the international community as a whole.

The reasons why the Greek Cypriot side rejected the plan are indeed well known to us, as well as to the United Nations and the EU. Recent efforts of the Greek Cypriot leadership to extract unilateral concessions from Turkey by exploiting its EU candidacy shed light on the main motive of the Greek Cypriot leadership in rejecting the plan and cast serious doubt on its expressed sincerity for a new United Nations process.

In fact, Mr. Papadopoulos, in his address to the Greek Cypriot people on the eve of the referenda calling for a resounding no to the plan, clearly revealed the strategy of the Greek Cypriot leadership following the rejection of the plan by the Greek Cypriots. In his speech, among other things, he stated, and I quote: "What will be the consequences if the people (Greek Cypriots) vote no at the referendum? ... within a week the Republic of Cyprus will become full and equal member of the EU. We will achieve a strategic goal that we have jointly set to upgrade and politically armor the Republic of Cyprus ... Turkey's accession course will also continue, thus Ankara will be under continuous evaluation for the adoption and implementation of the acquis communautaire, and Cyprus will be one of the evaluators".

Furthermore, the Greek Cypriot leader, by reiterating his demand that in a new United Nations process there should be no arbitration and no deadlines, is indeed giving the recipe for another 40 years of inconclusive negotiations, which can be utilized by the Greek Cypriot leadership for extracting unilateral concessions from Turkey and Turkish Cypriot side within the context of the EU. This is why Mr. Papadopoulos in his speech states that "... the existence of the United Nations negotiating framework cannot serve as a pretext for postponing or refusing o fulfil these obligations (by Turkey within the context of the EU)".

In view of the foregoing, it is naturally not convincing when Mr. Papadopoulos states that he remains committed "to holding negotiations under the umbrella of the United Nations" and "to a bizonal, bicommunal federal Cyprus". At this point, I would like to refer once again, to the above-mentioned report on your mission of good offices, in which you also stated, and I quote: "If the Greek Cypriots are ready to share power and prosperity with the Turkish Cypriots in a federal structure based on political equality, this needs to be demonstrated, not just by words, but by action" and "if they [Greek Cypriots] remain willing to resolve the Cyprus problem through a bicommunal, bizonal federation, this needs to be demonstrated. Lingering Greek Cypriot concerns about security and implementation of the plan need to be articulated with clarity and finality". Despite this call being reiterated by you on various occasions, it has not yet been properly responded to by the Greek Cypriot leadership. The failure and the unwillingness of the Greek Cypriot side to do so clearly demonstrate that it is not interested in a mutually acceptable settlement, despite continuously professing to the contrary.

The Greek Cypriot leader also claims that they "have been implementing substantial practical measures on the ground with the aim of building confidence and promoting the economic development of Turkish Cypriots". The truth, however, is quite different. The difficulties created and the delaying tactics employed by the Greek Cypriot administration on issues such as opening a school in Limassol for Turkish Cypriots residing in the South and opening of new crossing points for reciprocal crossings (i.e. Zodhia-Bostanci gate) are naturally not conducive to building confidence between the two communities. On the contrary, we have been witnessing a sharp increase in the racially motivated attacks against Turkish Cypriots visiting the South, in particular since the rejection of the Annan plan by the Greek Cypriots. Furthermore, the continuing blockage by the Greek Cypriot leadership of the approval by the European Council of the two draft regulations of the Commission (namely direct trade and financial aid regulations) and similar hostile policies of the Greek Cypriot side cannot be considered as promoting the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot people. On the contrary, it is clear

that the aim of the Greek Cypriot leadership is the total strangulation of the Turkish Cypriot people through further tightening of their isolation.

On the issue of the fate of the missing persons in Cyprus, it should be remembered that the resumption of the activities of the Committee of Missing Persons (CMP) came about as a result of the positive initiatives of the Turkish Cypriot side. We continue to believe that this question should be solved in accordance with the terms of reference of the Committee set up through the good offices of the then United Nations Secretary-General in 1981. The failure of the Committee so far to complete its mandate is not due to any lack of cooperation on the part of the Turkish Cypriot side.

As for the "welfare of the enclaved", it should be underlined that the term "enclaved", particularly following the opening of the borders for reciprocal crossings by the Turkish Cypriot side, has become an obsolete and a misleading terminology. However, the Greek Cypriot side continues to refer to the Greek Cypriots residing in the North as enclaved with political considerations.

Most important of all, I would like to draw your attention to the last sentence of Mr. Papadopoulos' address to the General Assembly where he states that: "We also visualize that, with Cyprus' membership to the European Union taking solid roots, a settlement would encompass an integration of the currently occupied area to the characteristics of a European society and the standards of the acquis communautaire in full harmony and osmosis with the rest of the island". In other words, in complete disregard of the international treaties on Cyprus and United Nations parameters established over four decades of negotiations, he openly and blatantly proposes the integration of the Turkish Cypriot people to the "Republic of Cyprus" as a mere minority. The Turkish Cypriot people have demonstrated their will and resolution for the reunification of the island in line with the international treaties on Cyprus and United Nations parameters, but they are also equally resolute in categorically rejecting a minority status in the island in a Greek Cypriot-run "Republic of Cyprus".

(*Signed*) Mehmet **Ali Talat**
President